

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 were previously pending. The applicants amend claims 1 and 14-17; cancel claims 3 and 19; and add new claims 20 and 21. Claims 1, 2, 4-18, 20, and 21 are presented for examination in view of the amendments and these remarks.

Claim Objections

The applicants have amended claims 10 and 16 and request that the objections to claims 10 and 16 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,355,946 ("Ishinaga"). Claim 1, as amended, recites "having a reflector part comprising a reflector body, on which a reflector material is disposed, wherein said reflector body comprises a ceramic[.]"

The examiner asserted that

With respect to claim 1, Ishinaga teaches an optoelectronic component comprising a housing body and at least one semiconductor chip (Fig. 5, 3A; referenced from Fig. 3) disposed thereon, said housing body having a base part comprising a connector body (Fig. 5, 1A), on which a connecting conductor material is disposed (Fig. 5, 2a/2b), and having a reflector part comprising a reflector body (Fig. 5, 52), on which a reflector material is disposed (Fig. 5, 52a), wherein said connector body and said reflector body are preformed separately from each other and said reflector body (Fig. 5, 52) is disposed on said connector body (Fig. 5, 1A) in the form of a reflector top.

Ishinaga disclosed that substrate 1A of base unit 1 can be made of a ceramic material (see col. 3, lines 45-53) and that a casing 5, 52 is preferably made of "a polycarbonate resin containing titanium oxide" (see, e.g., col. 2, lines 47-48; col. 4, lines 30-35; and col. 5, lines 11-22). Thus, Ishinaga has not been shown to disclose a reflector body that comprises a ceramic.

The distinction between a reflector body made of a resin as disclosed by Ishinaga and a reflector body comprising a ceramic as disclosed and claimed by the applicants is not inconsequential. Ceramics, as claimed by the applicants, can feature a high thermal conductivity or a low thermal resistance (see, e.g., paragraph [0023] of the applicants' specification as

published). Moreover, ceramic materials may have a particularly high resistance against the influence of ultraviolet radiation which might be emitted by the semiconductor chip. Resins, particularly polycarbonate resins, often degrade more quickly than ceramics under the influence of ultraviolet radiation. Accordingly, the applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, and 19 as being anticipated by Ishinaga be withdrawn.

The applicants do not concede that the limitation "wherein said connector body and said reflector body are preformed separately from each other" and other similar features are product by process limitations. As this issue is moot in view of the amendment discussed above, the applicants do not address this issue now but reserve the right to do so in the future.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), claim 4 was rejected under as obvious over Ishinaga, in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,060, 113 ("Banno"); claims 8, 17, and 18 were rejected as obvious over Ishinaga, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,707,069 ("Song"); claims 12 and 13 were rejected as obvious over Ishinaga, in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0189830 ("Sugimoto"); and claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Ishinaga, in view of Harada (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0230751). None of these secondary references has been shown to disclose or make obvious the "having a reflector part comprising a reflector body, on which a reflector material is disposed, wherein said reflector body comprises a ceramic[.]" Thus, Ishinaga, Banno, Song, Sugimoto, and Harada, alone or in combination, do not provide the basis for a prima facie case of obviousness of the pending claims.

The applicants do not concede that the suggested combinations of references are appropriate nor that the secondary references disclose the features for which they are cited. As these issues are moot in view of the preceding argument, the applicants do not address these issues now but reserve the right to do so in the future.

New claims

New claims 20 and 21 are supported by at least, for example, paragraphs [0006], [0026], and [0084] of the applicant's specification as published. Claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Moreover, none of the cited references has been shown to disclose an "insulation part that comprises a ceramic."

Conclusion

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least similar reasons as those for the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.


Applicant : Herbert Brunner et al.
Serial No. : 10/593,794
Filed : March 13, 2007
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 12406-0216US1 / P2004,0241
US N

This response is being filed simultaneously with a petition for a one-month extension of the period for response. The fees in the amount of \$120 for a one-month extension of time petition are being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 12406-0216US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 15, 2008


Sean M. Dean, Ph.D., J.D.
Reg. No. 46,656

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945